LIBRARY
SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

Vol. XX, No. 2 JUNE, 1961

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

E20G

CONTENTS

Page

THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (I) 33
By the Reverend Professor Hermann Sasse, Lic.Theol. (Berlin), S.T.M. (Hartford), D.Theol. (Erlangen), of Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.

THE BIBLE AND PHILOSOPHY 42
By the Reverend Colin Duncan, M.A. (Melb.), B.D. (London), Ph.D. (Cantab.), of Ridley College, Melbourne.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN BAPTIST THEOLOGY (II) .. 47
By the Reverend Professor Klaas Runia, Th.D. (Free University of Amsterdam), of the Reformed Theological College, Geelong, Vic.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES 50
(See inside back cover.)

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A. Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

BRIAN D. BAYSTON, LL.B., B.Com., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.

THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.

THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt. Edinburgh.

THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Sydney.

THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Cambridge.

THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 573 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, E.2, Victoria, Australia. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:

Ten Shillings, including postage. (Foreign, 12/-, U.S.A., $1.35.)

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XX JUNE, 1961 No. 2

The Second Vatican Council

1.

Shortly before World War II rumours were abroad about a new ecumenical council to be summoned by the Pope in connection with the fourth centenary of the Council of Trent which was opened on 13th December, 1545. If such plans existed for 1945 they were frustrated by the war. It is, however, most likely that the last period (18th January, 1562 to 4th December, 1563) of that great council that has created modern Roman Catholicism will coincide with the Second Vatican Council. Shortly after his succession, Pope John XXIII announced to the College of Cardinals, assembled in the Basilica of St. Paul on the Feast of the Conversion of Paul, 25th January, 1959, his intention to convene an ecumenical council. The announcement, made in deep emotion, as the allocution itself stated, was received with joy and unanimous approval. At Pentecost, 17th May, an "Antepreparatory Commission for the Ecumenical Council" was appointed with Cardinal Tardini as moderator. In his first encyclical, *"Ad Petri Cathedram,"* of Peter and Paul, 28th June, the Pope referred right in the beginning to the announcement. In the section which deals with the "Unity of the Church" he gives the following information(1): "Bishops from every part of the world will come to discuss matters important to religion. The Council's chief business will be concerned with the growth of the Catholic faith and the renewal along right lines of the habits of Christian people and the adapting of Christian discipline to the needs and conditions of the present time. That event will surely be a wonderful manifestation of truth, unity and charity; a manifestation indeed, which it is Our hope that those who behold it, but are separated from the Apostolic See, will receive as a gentle invitation to seek and find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father."

(1) The documents are quoted from the official English translation as contained in "Catholic Documentation," Sydney Sept. 1959 and Dec. 1960. Those not contained therein are translated directly from "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" 1959 and 1960.

The strong plea for reunion with Rome made in the following paragraphs shows that the reunion of Christendom will be, though not a topic of the agenda, yet one of the great thoughts pervading the whole work of the council.

With these actions began the first, the "antepreparatory" phase. All bishops in communion with Rome were asked to make suggestions and to express wishes. More than 2,000 replies were received, carefully digested and supplemented by the suggestions and opinions of the various sections of the Curia and of the universities. In the surprisingly short time of one year the work of the "Antepreparatory Commission" was finished. On Pentecost 1960 the next stage began with the Motuproprio *"Superno Dei nutu"* and a discourse (in Italian) by the Pope after Vespers on Pentecost Sunday in St. Peter's. Here he declared the "introductory" or "antepreparatory" phase finished and opened the second, the "preparatory" phase which is to go on until the third phase begins, "the celebration of the distinguished and general assembly: the council in its most resplendent solemnity," to be followed by the fourth stage, "the promulgation of the acts of the council." This classification shows what importance is attached to the two phases of preparation. Actually the council is already at work. The Motuproprio announces that the official name of the council shall be "The Second Vatican Council" *("Concilium Vaticanum Secundum")*. Technically it could have been summoned as a continuation of the Vatican Council of 1869/70 which has never been solemnly closed, but only adjourned. The document repeats from *Ad Petri Cathedram* the definition of the purpose of the council as quoted above. It establishes ten "Preparatory Commissions" whose number later may be increased, each to be presided over by a cardinal. They have to deal with (1) Theology (Scripture, tradition, faith morals), (2) Bishops and government of the dioceses, (3) Discipline of clergy and laity, (4) Religious orders, (5) Discipline of the Sacraments, (6) Liturgy, (7) Studies and seminaries, (8) The Eastern Churches, (9) Missions, (10) Lay apostolate; Catholic action, religious and moral. Their work is coordinated in a "Central Commission."

There is no commission so far to deal expressly with matters of reunion. But a special office is created together with the commissions: "In order to show more our love and good will towards those who claim the title of Christians *("qui Christiano nomine decorantur")*, but are separated *("sejuncti")* from this Apostolic See, and to enable them to follow better the labours of the council and make it easier for them to find the way to attain that

unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father, a special body *("coetus")* is established which will have as its moderator one of the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church to be named by Us. It will be constituted in the same way as the commissions mentioned above." Cardinal Bea, a German Jesuit, has meanwhile been appointed to that office.

An amazing amount of work has been done since Pentecost 1960. Already in July of that year a volume was published which contains all official documents up to that time. It is to be followed by three more volumes in which the whole work of the Antepreparatory Commission will be made available. Vol. II will contain the correspondence from the bishops all over the world. The indexes will give cross-references of the 8,987 suggestions submitted. A second series of volumes will contain the documents and acts of the Central Preparatory Commission and the special Commissions and secretariats. The whole work is so well advanced that the Pope has asked the faithful to pray that the council can be held in 1962. No definite date has as yet been announced, no "bull of convocation" issued. In the case of the First Vatican Council which began on 8th December (the Feast of the Immaculate Conception), 1869, the *"bulla convocationis"* appeared on 29th June, followed by the invitation of the schismatic Oriental Churches on 8th September and the letter addressed to "all Protestants and other non-Catholics" five days later. The only indications of the possible date are special prayers requested from the faithful and approved by the Pope. While the prayer in July is still for those who will take part in the council, the intentions for the months from August are directly for the Council. If the Vatican Council began on the day which commemorated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, this time the 15th of August, the Feast of the Assumption of Mary, might be regarded as the proper day in remembrance of the dogma proclaimed by Pius XII.

2.

The preparatory work has been tackled with an admirable promptness and efficiency. While this was possible thanks to the modern means of communication of which no-one would have dreamt when the First Vatican Council was prepared in the years 1864-9, it is obviously also due to the desire to accelerate the work the completion of which depends to a large degree upon the political situation of the world. The "intention" for the prayers in September 1962 is "that the work of the ecumenical council may proceed unhindered and be brought to the desired

conclusion." It is not necessary to go far back to the history of Trent and even to the ancient synods to realise what the political situation can mean for a council. Even the Vatican Council of 1869/70 could do its work only as long as Rome and the Papal State was protected by a French occupation force. The constitution *"Pastor Aeternus"* with the dogma of the pope's direct episcopal power over the entire church and his infallibility in defining a dogma was accepted and proclaimed as it were in the last possible moment on 18th July, 1870. The next day war broke out between Prussia and France. The bishops of the countries involved had to go home. The French troops had to be withdrawn. In September the Italian army occupied Rome. In October the council was adjourned *sine die*. What could happen to the Second Vatican Council if a major political conflict should break out with the council still in session? In this connection it may be observed that the Pope seems to have in mind a very brief council, as the prayers mentioned would indicate.

It was this difficult situation in which any council in the modern world might find itself which prompted a champion of the papal infallibility like Manning, then Archbishop of Westminister, to force the decision of 18th July, 1870. To the minority which declared the dogma to be inopportune he replied that the question was not whether it was opportune or inopportune to proclaim that doctrine, but whether or not it was true. If it must be regarded as true, then it had to be declared just in view of what could happen in the future when wars and revolutions as Manning anticipated would make it impossible to hold another council. The new dogma would make it possible for the church not only to survive, as it had survived more than three centuries since Trent without an ecumenical council, but also to carry on its business in proclaiming the divine revelation to the world by defining new dogmas, if necessary. The weight of this argument becomes evident if one thinks of the situation of the Eastern Church which locates more or less the infallibility of the church in the ecumenical council and, thus, is unable to proclaim a doctrinal decision of binding force because she cannot summon such council. It is easy to criticise the Roman doctrine of the Ecumenical Council as codified in the Codex Iuris on the basis of the Vatican decrees. Canon 220 says: "1. There can be no Ecumenical Council which were not summoned by the Roman Pontiff. 2. It belongs to the Roman Pontiff to preside over the Ecumenical Council either in person or through others, to determine the matters to be dealt with and the order in which they

have to be treated, to transfer, suspend, dissolve the council and to confirm its decrees." Can. 229 adds that in case the pope should die during the ecumenical council this would be automatically interrupted until the new pope — who, of course, can be elected only by the cardinals — orders it to be resumed and continued. We must ask what, then, an ecumenical Council actually is and whether it is not superfluous, especially since can. 227 states that its decrees cannot be of any obligation, unless they have been confirmed by the Roman Pontiff and promulgated at his command, and since can. 228,2 states that there cannot be an appeal from a sentence of the Pope to the Council. What does, in view of all these limitations, can. 228,1 mean: "The Ecumenical Council possesses the highest power over the Church Universal"?

Not only we are asking this question. It is the great problem for the Roman Church itself since 1870 when the dogma of the papacy was finished: Can the unique authority of the pope be reconciled with the *"suprema potestas in Universam Ecclesiam"* which Rome, following the tradition of the church of all ages attributes to an ecumenical council? This question will have to be answered by the forthcoming council. Its answer will determine the future relationship between Roman and Eastern Catholicism. It will open or forever close the door to a reunion of East and West. In this respect the Second Vatican Council will be one of the most momentous events in the history of the church. The decision of the First Vatican Council is, as any doctrinal decision made by the pope, irreformable, as the fateful constition *"Pastor aeternus"* states, Will it be possible to interpret it in such a way as to restore to the episcopate and to the ecumenical council such an amount of authority as would satisfy the Eastern churches? This is the first and paramount problem of reunion. For the Eastern Churches are the only ones which Rome recognises outside of its own orbit as parts of the Church Universal. Whatever possibilities of reunion may exist with those Christians who are separated, according to the view of Rome, not only from the Apostolic See, but also from the Church, such as Anglicans, Lutherans, Presbyterians, etc., the reunion of the Church means the reunion between Rome and the Orthodox Churches of the East, which must precede the reunion with us "separated brothers," as we are called in *"Ad Petri Cathedram."*

3.

As Rome will have to answer the question what, after all, an ecumenical council is which is completely dominated

by the pope, so the East will have to say what it understands by an ecumenical council and why it should not be governed by the pope. What makes a council ecumenical? The word "ecumenical" itself does not say that. *"He oikoumene (chora* or *ge)"* means for the Greeks the earth as far as it is inhabited by the Greeks in contradistinction to the countries inhabited by the barbarians.[2] In Luke 2:1, Acts 17:6, 19:27, 24:5 it means the Roman Empire, in other passages the entire world. It is similar as in the case of the words "catholic" or "universal" which by no means always must be understood in the strict sense. A synod of Carthage, if it is held for all North Africa like that of 418 can be called "universal" or "general." The word "catholic" soon became identical with "orthodox," perhaps already in the 2nd century. To Augustine the communion to which he belongs is in contradistinction from the Donatists, the *"communio catholica."* Constantin II writes a letter "to the people of the Catholic Church in Alexandria" (Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* II,2). In the liturgy of St. Mark the Patriarch of Alexandria who still today bears the title "pope," which originally belonged to every bishop, is mentioned in the following prayer: "The most holy and blessed pope N. who according to Thy foreknowledge rules also Thy Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and our Most Reverend Bishop N. Thou mayest preserve for many years and in peaceful times so that they may discharge the holy office of Thy High Priesthood which Thou hast entrusted to them . . ." (Brightman, *Liturgies I*, p. 129). "The holy, catholic and apostolic church" which the Pope of Alexandria governs is the church of his patriarchate which covers all Egypt and the countries south of Egypt.

Hence it is impossible to give an exact definition of what an Ecumenical Council is from the meaning of "ecumenical." There have been many synods in the Ancient Church. Some have been summoned as ecumenical (e.g., Sardica), but have never been recognised as such. There is at least one regional synod which has been regarded as ecumenical. This is our 2nd Ecumenical Council, Constantinople 381. Theodosius who called it invited only bishops from the East. No Western bishop, even not Damasus of Rome, received an invitation. No representative of any Western church was present. Another synod held at Constantinople 382 has called it "ecumenical," but this was not accepted until Chalcedon 451 approved the Creed of "the 150 Fathers" of Constantinople, our so-called "Nicene" Creed which only since the decision of Chalcedon replaced

(2) See the essay by G. Racoveanu quoted later.

the old Creed of Nicea 325. And it is the authority of that creed which caused Rome in the 6th century to join the East in calling the synod of 381 "ecumenical."

What, then, is for the Eastern Orthodox Church the essence of an ecumenical council? This question has been thoroughly debated by modern Eastern theologians and philosophers since Chomjakow's *The Unity of the Church* (around 1840). Chomjakow, Florenski, Arseniew, Bulgakow a.o. have tried to show that there is no individual institution of the Church, not even the ecumenical council, which can speak with infallibility. This infallibility belongs to the entire Church. According to Bulgakow the decisions of the councils have only a relative authority. Absolute authority they receive only when they are received by the Church Universal. This is rejected by others who maintain that the council speaks the truth as it is given by the Holy Spirit. We can here only state the fact that even in the Eastern Orthodox Church for which the Seven Ecumenical Synods are of binding authority there is no full agreement as to what an ecumenical synod is. There can be no dogma about that because no ecumenical synod has ever defined its own nature. The Rumanian theologian George Racoveanu has made an interesting contribution to the discussion of the problems of the forthcoming council in *Lumiere et Vie* Nr. 45, 1959, pp. 124-45: "L'Oecumenicite. Point de vue de l'Orthodoxie roumaine." He reaches the following conclusions: "The ecumenicity of a council is not determined by the number of bishops participating. — The ecumenicity of a council is not determined by the participation of bishops from all churches. — The ecumenicity of a council is not determined by the participation of all churches or by the proportion of such representation. —The ecumenicity of a council is not determined by the fact that it has been formally convened by the emperor, or by the imperial confirmation of its decrees" (loc. cit. 141). These negative sentences, the last of which refers, of course, to the ancient councils, are followed by the positive statement: "*The ecumenicity of a council is determined by the fact that the episcopate of the Church of Christ recognises its decrees as infallible. Ecumenicity means infallibility.*" The author goes on, criticising the view of Russian theologians who assume that the ecumenicity depends on the reception by the whole Christian people and seem to neglect the unique office of the bishops as successors of the apostles: "The seal of the Ecumenicity of a council is the Orthodoxy of its teaching. All merely formal criteria . . . are of no avail if this indispensable condition is not fulfilled: The recognition of its infallibility by the episcopate of the

Church." In other words, *an ecumenical council is a council which the church recognises as ecumenical.* This is the only possible definition. In the West it must be reognised by the one bishop who has as successor of Peter in Rome the *plenitudo potestatis* and the *magisterium* over the whole church. In the East it is the *numerus episcoporum.*

4.

We who are "separated" from the Church, as Rome understands it, whose "churches" are no real churches, should watch the great discussion between Rome and the East with deepest interest. The breach between Western and Eastern Catholicism was and is one of the greatest tragedies in the history of the Church. In the last analysis it was not doctrine which split the Catholic church. Non-theological factors, the cultural and political differences and contrast between the Greek East and the Latin West, facts which are older than the church, are the real cause of that which later became a great theological issue. Today the one great theological question which divides both churches is the ecclesiology. Will the Second Vatican Council be able to finish the doctrine *De ecclesia Christi* which could not be finished in 1870? And will the dogma at which it may arrive or which it will prepare be acceptable to the East? Will again non-theological, political factors separate those who recognise each other as parts of one Church?

When we watch this discussion and the work which the council will have to do in regard to the reunion between East and West, we cannot be mere onlookers. For what happens in one sector of Christendom affects all the others. For there is a solidarity of sin and guilt, of divine judgment and human suffering which still binds together those who confess Christ as Lord and Saviour, even if other bonds have been broken. What the council will mean to us poor "non-Catholics" who cannot be invited because we have no bishops recognised by Rome, and what the existence of such separated brothers means to the conscience of our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians, as a reminder of their sins, and as a cause of profound sorrow that we shall discuss later. What we must do in preparing ourselves for the great discussion with Rome which will come in connection with the council is a thorough examination of our own thoughts on the church and its unity. We must clarify the meaning of words such as "catholic," "ecumenical" which we use often so carelessly. The word "ecumenical," for instance, has received among us a new meaning during the last generation which it never had before. Today one would in Protestant circles

not call world-wide organisations of one denomination "ecumenical" as the Methodists did when they founded in 1881 their "Ecumenical Methodist Conference." This word is now used for interdenominational, interchurch movements and organisations. For modern Anglicans or Protestants an Ecumenical Council would be a council in which many, if not all, churches were represented, not only Rome and the Eastern churches, but also Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Lutherans, Presbyterian and Reformed, Disciples and the various union churches of all parts of the world. From this point of view an Assembly of the World Council of Churches would be much more ecumenical than any Council of the Vatican could be. If this understanding of ecumenicity is correct, then the Vatican Council could not claim any more ecumenicity than a World Assembly of one of the great non-Roman denominations. But this would then apply also to the great ecumenical councils like Nicea. In Nicea there was present, at the request of the emperor, the Novatian Bishop of Constantinople, but the Novatian Church was not represented. Why not? Why had it never occurred to the Ancient Church that the great divisions of Christendom, which were not less scandalous than the present ones, could be overcome by negotiations at a synod? Because the lawful synod can always be only a synod of the orthodox church. Heretics and schismatics have no place in a synod of the church, and if they appear they are solemnly excommunicated. *Ecumenicity is orthodoxy.* This rule is correct and applies to all ages and to all Christians. The convictions may differ as to who is orthodox, who a schismatic or a separated brother, as they differed in Africa when the Donatists regarded the Catholics as heretics while Augustine and Optatus of Mileve tried to prove that the Donatists were not heretics, but only schismatics and even separated "brothers." Modern Protestants may laugh at such distinctions and accuse the ancient church of lack of love and brotherliness. They should ask whether this reproach would not also be directed against the apostles John and Paul. They should ask what it means that even the World Council of Churches — at least it has given up, probably in the interest of the Eastern churches the proud name of an "Ecumenical Council" — has retained a last remnant of that principle in its basis which excludes unitarian churches and similar communities. Thus the preparation of the new council compels us to rethink our own ecclesiology in the light of the Word of God.

H. SASSE.

(To be continued.)

The Bible and Philosophy*

In this address I shall make one point, and then illustrate it.

If you ask why there is a relationship between the Bible and philosophy, the answer is, quite simply, that Christians, or men of Biblical faith, are under the necessity to express and communicate their faith to others, in order to persuade them. Now the media of communication are two:—

(a) Direct communication, through the employment of language and ideas; and these are properly the field of philosophy.

(b) Indirect communication, by example, suggestion and manner of life, so that others "catch on" before grasping the thing directly. This is properly the field of personal religion and piety (and there is room for a great deal to be said here, but I must not do so, as it does not belong to this paper).

So far as direct communication is concerned the picture is not a straightforward one. It is, in my view, vain to look for a perennial philosophy which is the particularly appropriate Christian one. The idea that there *should* be such a philosophy has mesmerised some minds, perhaps under the influence of Plato's desire to find that thesis which is beyond hypothesis — thus they have tended to find an answer in rational metaphysics because they look to be "right." I must say that I do not accept any such perennial philosophy simply because philosophy itself changes its own grounds.

The truth of the matter is that, in the career of Christendom, constantly changing relationships have taken place between the Bible and philosophy. I will try to illustrate this by looking at three specimen periods (which by no means complete the story, of course):—

(i) What first caused Christians to take account of philosophy? It was questions like the nature of knowledge as raised by the Gnostics, the nature of law as raised by the Stoics, the question of the unique in a world which argued only in universals and particulars, and the nature of reality, whether it were to be reckoned (with the Platonists) as eternal, or (with the Bible) as historic. Christians had to find answers, and, in the course of doing so, new features of distinctively Christian philosophy emerged: e.g., Clement of Alexandria's doctrine of

*An Address given at the Ridley College Convention, Melbourne, 1960.

the True Gnosis, Pseudo-Dionysius' way of paradox, Augustine's metaphysic of self-consciousness which is simultaneously God-consciousness, and the two-way traffic in knowledge which sees no absolute distinction between reason and revelation, whereby the outward traffic encounters and apprehends what is before it, and the return traffic seeks to explain to the self what it is that has been encountered.

(ii) In the mediæval period the strong challenge of a revived Aristotelianism (i.e., an essentially Greek philosophy) forced the Church to defend its Biblical way of life based on Angustinian theology. The work of St. Thomas Aquinas in this situation was to try to show that the Christian faith can be expressed in terms of Aristotelian metaphysics. His work was a failure; and it left behind it that nasty problem of the relationship between reason and revelation which has bedevilled modern thinking. (A simple solution to this problem is to see that Aquinas formulated the question wrongly in the first place, and we need not bind ourselves to his method at all.)

(iii) With the breakdown of the Mediæval world, and the emergence of classical rationalism and the specialised dogmatic sciences, yet another situation has cropped up. In the last two centuries it has been assumed by philosophers, and continental theologians of the Hegelian school, that philosophy proposed a superior view of life to that of the Bible. This probably has its characteristic expression in Lessing's "eternal truths of reason." Philosophy was supposed to be able to prove its own assertions, but the Bible was not supposed to be so able. Again, philosophy was credited with being "objective" and detached, and this was held to be a mark of superiority, because it was thus deemed to be free from that subjective whim which is assumed to be arbitrary and unreliable, and because it offered that "middle ground" of argument by which truth could be seen. This was quite important in so much philosophy — it was almost a touchstone in pure rationalism, which uncritically assumes that reality is "out there," independent of us, and will remain so. The Bible, on the other hand, was accused of containing so much that is influenced by auto-suggestion, mystical experience and the supernatural that it is incapable of being impartial.

This view was axiomatic to philosophers, and some theologians; and it held good only because philosphy was

considered to be a "something" in itself, which arbitrated on the truth and judged the world. But this view has now changed in our times; and the truly important and significant thing is that the change took place inside philosophy itself. Modern philosophy, as exemplified by Phenomenology, Existentialism, linguistic and descriptive analysis, has lowered its sights, on the basis of its own contention that some of the propositions with which pure rationalism has concerned itself are unreal. Modern philosophy argues that it is not its business to deal in absolutes and ultimates and universal formulas (for half of them are beyond the range of significant discourse anyway); and that the business of philosophy is much more pedestrian: i.e., to help us find our way around in our given experiences.

Now, given experience involves Christian experience; and Christians find that they are colliding inevitably with the techniques and concerns of modern philosophy. Once more, therefore, Christians are being obliged to take account of philosophy because they must deal with questions concerning, for e.g., the nature of existence, the function of language, and the meanings of propositions. Christians are forced to ask "What does Christian existence imply?" "What is the function of Biblical language?" "What are the meanings of Biblical propositions?"

This is a new situation, therefore, in which philosophy itself is under scrutiny from itself; and the classical expostulations regarding the "eternal truths of reason" and the validity of logical propositions are in the melting pot. This is a highly interesting and opportune situation for Christians, who are still under the obligation to communicate their faith. This is, in fact, one of the big tasks ahead of the Church right now; and there is evidence that the Church is not lacking in philosophers who have grappled with this situation. For example, in German theology we find Barth injecting a significant element of existentialism into his work, whilst Bultmann leads the movement in which there is a new alliance between theology and phenomenology. In England Ramsey and Foster and Hare and Wilson and others are trying to write Christian theology with an eye on the techniques of linguistic analysis. In America Niebuhr and Herberg are finding that paradox, tension, and dialectic are better categories for a Christian theologian to work with than are the traditional rational ones.

If the foregoing observations are correct, they will substantiate the main point that changing relationships have taken place between the Bible and philosophy. And the further inference is that the relationship between the

Bible and philosophy is mainly an apologetic one. This is, I would judge, always the strategy of communication, and I cannot see that thoughtful Christians can avoid being forced into it. But it is always a delicate position to maintain. The danger point is that in showing the aptness of this or that philosophy to Bible truth, you will end up by contending for the philosophy rather than the "faith once delivered unto the saints," if you are not exceedingly vigilant. If that happens it means that you allow philosophy to dictate to the Bible what is genuine and what is not, what things are live options for men and what are not — this irrespective of the Biblical witness. This, of course, will not do, because it is a tacit admission that the last word lies with philosophy. It may seem to be a right intellectual conclusion; but it will not be acceptable to anyone who knows the history of philosophy, because that is a history of changing estimates. Would you want to leave the last word with that?

It is not the business of philosophy to propose truth. That was alright for Plato (and let it be said it was also a mighty effort on his part); but it is not alright for those who have the Bible (as the post-war Biblical theologians of Germany have made so clear to us). Those who accept the Biblical witness see that philosophy's task is to assist in interpreting and communicating truth — but the truth will be encountered on grounds other than philosophy. For a Christian truth is first of all a "Who," not a "What"; and philosophy is powerless to produce that. Of its very nature philosophy is hypothetical — it must make an arbitrary beginning, and each particular philosophy takes something as its starting point which it will not surrender. It is important to realise this, because it will stop us giving too much authority to philosophy. The Bible, too, has its initial dogmatism from which it cannot be made to depart. It has just as much right as philosophy to have one, and its starting point is equally valid and important. The difference in the starting points is that philosophy starts with this or that hypothesis or assumption, but the Bible begins from Divine revelation; and revelation is not an hypothesis or a proposition, but a series of Acts of God in different situations having to do with humanity in all its involvements. (This, by the way, is the difference between Greek and Biblical metaphysics.)

What we really have here is the problem of authority. Where does authority lie? With philosophy or the Bible? This antithesis is not a real one for some philosophers and theologians these days, as we have seen; but, for others, not appreciating philosophy's internal criticism of itself,

the old dilemma seems to persist: i.e., either you go with Tertullian and say that the matter lies beyond reason ("It is incredible, therefore I must believe it"), or you go with those who distort the Biblical message in the interests of a self-originated intellectualism. There is no way out of this dilemma, except a frank recognition that it is needless in the first place. Had this been recognised more frequently, much wearisome striving and contending would have been saved.

The fact is that philosophy can neither prove nor disprove the Bible. Philosophy is fundamentally a method of investigation and communication. It may find difficulty with some features of Divine revelation, e.g., sin, miracles, the occurrence of the unique, the wisdom of God that is foolishness to men, grace, and the like, but it may not pronounce them bogus or impossible, unless features of revelation cancelled each other out. That, in fact, has never happened.

The Bible's authority is important in the world of knowledge and conduct and faith. It has every right to its authority, which it derives from the fact that it is the Word of God. Philosophy cannot prove or disprove that, either — it can only recognise that the phenomenon exists: whilst the Bible, on its side, will employ many useful and meaningful techniques of philosophy in making its proclamation vivid and intelligible.

The real supremacy of the Bible for the Christian lies in the fact that it is not a piece of self-originated intellectualism. It starts not from a logical proposition but with a God Who acts, Who spake by the prophets and other holy men being impelled by the Holy Spirit. Its genesis is divine, and it stands in judgment upon human attempts to legislate about the issues of life.

We no longer try to reconcile an uneasy partnership between philosophy and the Biblical revelation, like the Scottish minister whose prayer began "O Thou who art our ultimate hypothesis and our eternal hope!" The need to do that has passed. The Bible presents us with our eternal hope, and philosophy helps us to communicate it to a world of lost men.

COLIN DUNCAN.

Recent Developments in Baptist Theology

(Continued from p. 23)

Unfortunately space does not permit us to give a rather thorough discussion of the whole problem of the *correlation between baptism and faith.* No doubt this correlation belongs to the essence of the sacrament, also to the essence of baptism. As a matter of fact this has never been denied by the advocates of infant baptism. We also admit that in the case of infant baptism we are never able to make the nature and reality of the correlation fully transparent. The various solutions, which have been suggested in the course of the centuries (for example, "fides infantilis," or "fides aliena," either of the parents, or the sponsors, or the whole congregation), only prove that every attempt at making this correlation transparent in a direct way, is fore-doomed to failure. No more is the appeal to the "gratia praeveniens" motif — God's prevenient grace would nowhere become more visible than here — a sufficient justification of the practice of infant baptism.[47]

However, the decision does not at all depend on our possibility or impossibility to explain the correlation. Rightly the Reformers have always refused to build the case of infant baptism on this rational (istic) foundation. In their view the decision lies in our obedience to the *divine commandment.* The Form for the Baptism of infants, used in the Reformed Churches of Holland and dating from the 16th century, states: "And although our children do not understand these things (namely, the three principal parts of the doctrine of baptism, mentioned before), we may not therefore exclude them from baptism, since they are without their knowledge partakers of the condemnation in Adam, and so again received unto grace in Christ," and then the Form immediately goes on to mention Gen. 17:7 and Acts 2:39, as proofs of the inclusion of the children of believers in God's covenant. This is fully in line with the teaching of the Reformers themselves. For them the decisive point was not our understanding of the correlation, nor the active participation in the correlation on the side of the children themselves, but God's implicit commandment.

We should never forget that we have exactly the same situation with regard to the sign and seal of the old covenant, namely circumcision. Here, too, the correlation is essential, as clearly appears from Rom. 4:11. And yet

47. James Gray rightly points this out in Studies on Baptism, 8ff.

God Himself commanded all the children of Abraham and later on of Israel to be circumcised on the eighth day. He commanded it in His inscrutable wisdom and immeasurable mercifulness, because He knew that this correlation would begin to function *at His appointed time.* Again, this was the teaching of the Reformers. According to Luther, a child is brought to baptism in the earnest expectation that he will believe, and we pray that God will give him faith. Yet we do not baptise him on that ground, but on the ground that God commanded it. Baptism has an objective character apart from faith, since it is grounded on God's Word as covenant.[48] Likewise Calvin always stressed that a child is baptised unto future faith and repentance.[49] Both Reformers could say this, because they were so fully aware of the fact that our faith does not add anything to baptism. Faith is not a complement, without which baptism is incomplete. But it is rather the empty hand, with which we personally accept the promises signified and sealed in the sacrament. Of course, this acceptance is an integral part of the sacramental correlation. Yet the sacrament of baptism does not stand or fall with it, in this sense that the correlation has to be crystallised *in the moment* of the actual baptism of the infant. Within the covenantal relationship the temporal aspect is subordinate to the divine promise, which is primary and basic, and indeed fully has the character of "gratia praeveniens."

* * *

Much more could, of course, be said about this book. It would be very interesting to discuss the exegesis of the various New Testament passages and the delineation of the Old Testament background, as given in the first part of the volume. Here, too, we meet again and again with a fresh approach of the problems involved. It is certainly not an overstatement when we say that this volume provides a basis for further discussions. It is not any longer a matter of two theologies, which have no real point of contact, because they have no common starting point, but there is an open-mindedness for the position of the others, which is no less than amazing.

At the same time the advocates of infant baptism must be equally prepared to listen to their Baptist brethren. There are indeed many impure elements both in doctrines and practices, defended by Paedobaptists. One of the greatest impurities is that the Corpus Christianum motif, in spite of its theological and practical untenability, still

48. Cf. Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism (The Church of Scotland), 1957, 24.
49. Cf. Interim Report, 44; G. C. Berkouwer, op. cit. 68f.; R. S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, 1957, 189f.

seems to be at a premium. Nearly all Churches (including the Roman Catholic Church) seem to hold the principle of the "national church" (the "Volkskirche"), and they baptise every child presented for this sacrament. In this way, however, the Church itself desecrates the sacrament. If this sacrament is also for the children — and we on our part wholeheartedly believe this — then it is only for the *children of believers*. That is, of those who profess the Christian faith and live in accordance with their confession; who themselves earnestly desire that their child (either natural or adopted) may be baptised and of whom we may expect on good grounds that they will give their child a really Christian upbringing. To ask more is to go beyond the scriptural limits. To ask less is nothing else than disobedience on the part of the Church.

As long as the Paedobaptist Churches stick to the present practice of "Volkskirche"-baptism, they will not have any real answer to the Baptist charges. All their theological purity is then of no avail, for it breaks down on the illegitimate practice. This practice cannot be defended in any way. It cannot be defended by pleading on the basic continuity of the two covenants. For such a plea would lose sight of the element of discontinuity, which is given with the Christ event. It cannot be defended either in the way of Cullmann, who appeals to Jesus' death on the cross, which he calls a general Baptism, for all men, and once for all. "It belongs to the essence of this general Baptism effected by Jesus, that it is offered in entire independence of the decision of faith, and understanding of those who benefit from it."[50] From this general Baptism on Golgotha there would be a straight line to our baptism. The two are "connected in their innermost essence as divine acts, wholly independent of men." — In this conception the covenant-idea is stretched out to the point of actual breaking. The correlation between sacrament and faith is fully submerged in the "gratia praeveniens" — idea and the door is wide open for an unrestricted and indiscriminate baptism of all children, yes, actually of all people!

In the Bible, however, God's grace is the grace of the covenant, which was and is established with the believers and their seed. The death and resurrection of Christ can never be separated from this covenant.The sacraments cannot be separated from it either. It is one whole, and the legitimacy of infant baptism stands and fall with its being part of this whole.

K. RUNIA.

50. Cullmann, op. cit. 20.

Book Reviews

FIDES QUAERENS INTELLECTUM

By Karl Barth. Translated by Ian W. Robertson (S.C.M. Press, London), 1960, pp. 173; 25/-.

The so-called ontological argument for God's existence associated with the name of Anselm has always intrigued the philosophers, though it has often failed to convince them. Refuted by one and recast by another, it preserves its strange vitality. The point of Karl Barth's masterly exegesis of Proslogion ii-iv is that the philosophers have really no rights in this matter, that what Anselm offers is theology of the purest water, and that nothing could be farther from the truth than to suppose he wants to demonstrate God's existence *a priori*. Nor is this contention to be taken lightly; few commentators can have devoted such pains to set these chapters in the whole context of Anselm's thinking, as few have probed so carefully each detail of the text. Barth insists that Anselm is seeking, as he says he is, to undertand what he believes, and that in all his writings what he wants to understand is the faith he holds within the Church, the faith that rests entirely on revelation, yes, "the Word of those who preach Christ." He asks therefore not at all *whether* an item in this faith is true, but *how far* and *in what sense* it is true. His method is to single out a particular article in the Creed and to show that it follows from, coheres with, other articles assumed to be known.

The chapters in question in the Proslogion show him at work in precisely this way. He "proves" the existence of God not, as some have supposed, from a concept that is part of the furniture of the human mind as such, but from "the revealed Name of God." God is *aliquid quo nihil maius cogitari possit.* (By a slip, the *"maius"* is omitted on p. 73.) The two arguments that follow, one "that God truly is," and the other "that He cannot be thought of as not existing," are treated as marking two distinct stages in Anselm's procedure. In the first (Proslogion ii) God's existence is established in the sense in which anything is said to exist, not *in intellectu* only but also *in re*. In the second (Proslogion iii) we advance to the demonstration of God's existence in the strict and peculiar sense, that in which He is the source of all existence and not merely one existent among many. The conclusion reached is that the denial of God's existence is possible only to the fool, who in fact is all the while denying something that is not to be identified with God Himself. Yet, as Barth constantly reminds us, in all this what we have is not what we have been led to suppose, a construction *a priori*, but "the proof of an article of faith which still holds good apart from all proof."

To criticise Barth's exposition is for those only who have devoted the time to the subject that he has given. There can be no doubt that anyone who proposes to take Anselm seriously will have to do the same with this book. Certainly, the context of worship and prayer in which the argument is set is of decisive importance for the understanding of it. Anselm throws into the form of a train of reasoning what has been borne in upon him as a worshipper who stands within the tradition of the Church. But there are still some questions one would like to put to Barth. Is the clear-cut distinction between theology and philosophy with which he operates one that can be carried back without qualification into the early Middle Ages? Again, though every other sentence is most carefully investigated, Barth has little to say of the one that points most strongly in the direction opposed to that which he takes. It runs: "I thank thee, good Lord, I thank thee, that what I at first believed because of thy gift, I now know because of thy illumining in such a way that *even if I did not want to believe*

thine Existence, yet I could not but know it." (Italics the reviewer's.) Does not this suggest a knowledge in some sense finally independent of faith, even though beginning from it?

E. L. ALLEN.

A HISTORY OF ISRAEL

By John Bright [Old Testament Library] (S.C.M. Press, London), 1960, pp. 500 and maps; 40/-.

For a long time now teachers of the Old Testament have wished for a textbook that is concise and comprehensive, scholarly without being pedantic, up to date, yet with a balanced perspective. Dr. John Bright, of Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, has now met this need with a superb study that is altogether beyond praise. This is exactly the book we have been waiting for. It immediately supercedes and outmodes even its most recent competitors, and will undoubtedly be a standard reference work for some time to come. The book is admirably designed for the general student, and beautifully printed, with maps, charts, indices, and select bibliography augmented by concise footnotes. Especially commendable is the Prologue and first chapter (pp. 17-59) — a deft sketch of the historical background of Israel's beginnings. After this the author traces the history of Israel to the end of the Old Testament times. In a short review there is no space to list the numerous felicities of this carefully written work. With its lucid analyses of issues and its swift summaries of evidence it is a model and a delight. The result is a history that is at once more critical (in the proper sense of basing conclusions on evidence) and more conservative than any similar work.

Dr. Bright is at his best in his brilliant chapter on the Patriarchs (Ch. 2). This reviewer has never read anything more sensible than the author's definition of the problem of relating biblical and extrabiblical evidence on pp. 66-69. Unfortunately this preoccupation with the setting and the method of the history leaves little space for the history itself. All the data should in the end yield something, if only an outline. Nevertheless he does insist strongly on the historical authenticity of the biblical traditions, rising to the height of asserting "with full confidence that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were actual historical individuals" (p. 82), but not overstating his case when it comes to details.

A more serious defect, however, at least in the opinion of this reviewer, is the inequality with which Dr. Bright applies his own principles. Thus he has reacted strongly against the school of Alt and Noth in reinstating the patriarchal traditions as substantially correct, in spite of the admitted lack of a single item of confirmatory evidence. He leans on circumstantial corroboration and on the negative fact that nothing "has come to light contradicting any item in the tradition" (p. 67). [Even this is an exaggeration, because he dismisses the patriarchs' camels as anachronistic (p. 72) with the argument that they were not typical camel nomads, overlooking the distinctive feature of the narratives that the camels are mentioned in the special cases of long journeys to Mesopotamia.] Yet in the critical period of exodus and conquest — where the same situation obtains, viz., lots of indirect corroboration and no external contradiction of biblical tradition — he embraces extensively the general contentions of previous historians and many of the particulars of the Alt-Noth school, including the key hypotheses that the twelve-tribe system was created after the conquest and that only a small nucleus were involved in the exodus. The result is an anticlimax when one passes to Ch. 3 (Exodus and Conquest).

Admittedly this is a very complex question, but on Dr. Bright's own showing there is a deep continuity of tradition from Abraham through Moses, including theological continuity (p. 69). The patriarchal

migration was "the nucleus of the later Israel" (p. 86). Yet there is equivocation when it comes to relating patriarchal religion to normative Yahwism. In the first place, by leaning on the external contemporary evidence he inverts the patriarchal covenant into a choice of a god by an individual, a procedure which causes him to overlook the unique features present in Israel's religion from its patriarchal origin — features which, it could be argued, explain, rather than are explained by, the religious elements of the exodus. The issue is succinctly this — whether the beginnings of Israel's national faith lie at Sinai (as Dr. Bright says on p. 115), or were forged at the crossing of the Red Sea (as he says rather inconsistently on p. 111) — "the constitutive event that had called her into being as a people," or whether the account of the Bible is to be accepted when it grounds that covenant faith in the call of Abraham — a feature which even these earliest cultic confessions on which weight is rested, viz., Deut. 6:20-25; 26:5-10; Jos. 24:2-13, fully attest. And if the faith of Israel, and indeed, Israel herself, was forged by the crossing of the Red Sea, by what theory are we to explain how this merely potential people got there in the first place? The exodus story, with its constant reference to the covenant with Abraham, offers a solid and convincing explanation, and even Dr. Bright is willing to recognise that "the note of promise is scarcely a retrojection of later belief" (p. 91); yet he repeatedly insists that there was no such thing as a people of Israel before the Exodus (p. 9, 17, 78, etc.). When, in the end, he says that "we should, indeed, not speak of tribes in Egypt, for there was no tribal system there" (p. 125), in spite of clear evidence like Ex. 4:29, we perhaps have grounds for charging him with that same "subjectivism" which he so frequently levels against Noth. Quite apart from the key points of the supposed independent movement of the tribes in conquest and the alleged creation of an amphictyonic league after conquest (each of which is in flat contradiction to the wide and consistent biblical tradition that twelve tribes went into Egypt and came out and conquered Canaan together, which we may be permitted to hold on to until *positive* evidence to the contrary is forthcoming), a cause of much of the misconstruction of the religious development of the Mosaic era is the wrong equation of the origins of Israel's faith with the origin of the word Yahweh. The two are not necessarily the same, and the role of Moses would be viewed, in accord with the account in Exodus, as that of a reformer rather than an innovator. It is incredible that a man of alien background should appear from the desert and persuade "a conglomeration of slaves" (p. 125) to go out from Egypt to worship a god they had never heard of before. But the reiterated theme of Exodus, that the people cried to God, and He heard their groaning and remembered his covenant with Abraham (Ex. 2:23f., etc.) not only makes the career of Moses a coherent piece of history, but provides also that bridge from the patriarchal age which is absolutely essential for Dr. Bright's own insistence on the continuity of Abraham's religion with that of later Israel (p. 93). And it is also of a piece with the biblical tradition of a constitutional continuity as well.

Among much incidental evidence for this, one small item might be mentioned in passing. The names of tribal heads in Num. 1, together with their patronymics provide a corpus of twenty-four names ostensibly Mosaic in age, and bound up with the claims that the twelve-tribe system was in full operation in the wilderness. It is a remarkable fact that the majority of the names are theophoric, and that among them as many as twenty-three divine names present archaic forms like Sadday and Sur are found besides 'El, 'Am, etc.; while all five of the not identifiably theophoric names end in the archaic —a/on. *There is no trace of the name Yahweh!* This is under-

standable if the twelve-tribe system is older than the widespread use of Yahweh, but inexplicable if the list is made out to be a fiction, or a retrojection (i.e., fictional only in date) of an organisation that was the product of the adoption of Yahweh as the dominant designation of God.

Space precludes the addition of comments on the later parts of the book. One might observe, however, that it is a pity that so much space is given to the "prehistory" of Israel (one-fifth of the book), while only sixteen pages are available for such an important and complex phase of Israel's history as the Greek period. The book is also uneven in the attention it gives to the religious constitution and life of Israel in successive times. But you can't have everything, and these small faults are more than compensated for by the general excellence of Dr. Bright's achievement.

F. I. ANDERSEN.

A CHURCH HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

By J. H. S. Burleigh (Oxford University Press, London), 1960, pp. 455; 62/- (Aust.).

The present century has been productive of a number of excellent works on various periods in and aspects of the life of Ecclesia Scoticana, but has lacked a comprehensive one volume survey extending from the time of Ninian and Columba to the present. This deficiency has now been remedied here by the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh.

Published in the year of the fourth centenary of the Scottish Reformation when the author was Moderator of the General Assembly of the National Church, the section on that central phase in the long and turbulent history of the Kirk is of special significance. How was the Reformation Church related to what went before and what came after? First, as to the Mediaeval Church, the anti-papalism of the *Confession of Faith* and the *Book of Discipline* "savours of revolution rather than reform. Continuity with the old Church is explicitly disowned . . . Not continuity but restoration is the operative principle . . . But if formal and external continuity is slighted, the essential continuity of faith is insisted on" (p. 177). Second, as to the Melvillian Church, whilst Knox was not a Presbyterian, in the sense that he did not propose a system of church government by presbyteries, yet "those who a generation later introduced that system into the Scottish Church and proudly accepted the designation Presbyterian, rightly regarded themselves as his spiritual heirs and defenders of the inheritance of doctrine and practice they had received from him" (p. 176). However, whilst it may be difficult to perceive the continuity of witness with the Church immediately antecedent to the Reformation, the institutional continuity with that subsequent is clearly apparent, and it is of interest to note that Dr. Burleigh, whilst cautiously stating that the office of Superintendent may have been suggested by the experience of the Lutheran Churches, holds to its intended temporary nature in asserting that "the impression is definitely given that it was conceived as a missionary agency to meet an urgent need of the moment, if the Reformation was to be carried to the whole nation within a measurable time" (p. 170).

As a signatory to the recent ill-fated "Bishop's Report" the author writes in an eirenical manner of the Presbyterian-Episcopalian controversy, but few will concur in his apologia for James Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews (1661-79), with his inheritance of the moderatism of the North-east, when it is concluded that "the attacks made on his character and conduct are understandable, but we may be more charitable now in an age which knows how easily the motives of 'collaborators' are misunderstood" (p. 265). On the other hand it is

rightly maintained that the testimony of the Covenanters was "the seed . . . from which has grown the spiritual freedom enjoyed by the Church of Scotland today, which is admired and coveted by other Churches" (p. 256). In referring to contemporaneous parallels to the Scottish Disruption on the Continent of Europe it is erroneously stated that the orthodox secession from the theologically liberalising Dutch National Church in 1839 was headed by Dr. Abraham Kuyper (p. 353), who actually led the larger secession of The Doleance in 1886. An incomplete and misleading picture is given in the statement that "with 518 congregations the United Presbyterian Church was almost as strong numerically as the Free Church" (p. 363), for whilst by 1847 (the date of the formation of the former from the United Secession and Relief Churches) the latter in four years had built 700 churches it was rapidly consolidating its position and extending its influence so that through the second half of the nineteenth century it was almost twice the size and strength of the other Church.

Characterised generally by an impartiality of spirit, Dr. Burleigh throughout relates movements on the Scottish terrain to the wider European and English contexts. Whilst lacking the apparatus of extensive foot-notes, wide learning lies behind the volume which provides for the general reader a balanced and reliable presentation of the history of the Kirk. In addition to an exhaustive index of 30 pages, there are added as appendices, a short select Biography, a Table of Kings of Scots to the Union of Crowns, and a chart of the labyrinthine Divisions and Reunions of the Scottish Church, 1690-1929, which should have been extended and brought up to date with the union of the Original Secession Church with the Church of Scotland in 1956.

R. SWANTON.

THE THEOLOGY OF DIETRICH BONHOEFFER

By John D. Godsey (S.C.M. Press, London), 1960, pp. 299; 25/-.

Who was Dietrich Bonhoeffer? What did he write? Why does his name crop up so often in recent theological discussion? Is he worth serious study? These are some of the questions answered by the Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at Drew University, U.S.A., in this book which is an indispensable introduction to its subject.

There are some things which Professor Godsey does not do. He doesn't provide a slick account of Bonhoeffer's theology, neatly labelled and pigeon-holed so that you do not need to read Bonhoeffer himself. Nor does he make Bonhoeffer a stalking-horse for his own ideas. He does something far better and much more useful. He gives a careful exposition of Bonhoeffer's writings from *Sanctorum Communio,* written in 1927, when he was only twenty-one, to the *Letters and Papers from Prison,* which contain his ripest theological thinking in the two years spent in prison before his untimely death at the hands of the Nazis on 9th April, 1945, at the age of thirty-nine. The exposition is divided into three chapters, each preceded by a biographical introduction which traces the course of Bonhoeffer's life and gives some indication of the background to his theological development. This is very necessary, more necessary indeed, in the case of Dietrich Bonhoeffer than of any other contemporary theologian, with the possible exception of Reinhold Niebuhr. For Bonhoeffer was no armchair theologian, secure in an ivory tower from which he writes in serene detachment. He was from the first deeply immersed in the life of every-day, both in the church and the world. A year in Barcelona, another in the United States, and a third in London all enriched his knowledge of men and affairs and laid the foundation of his work for the ecumenical movement. Drawn into the struggle of the Confessing Church against the Nazis Government Bonhoeffer became tutor in an illegal seminary for the training

of ministers for the Confessional Church. In 1939, when the international scene was already overshadowed by the threat of war, his friends in England and America were eager for him to leave Germany, believing that thereby he might be preserved for future service. Bonhoeffer did go to the United States in June, but, realising that he had made a mistake, he returned immediately to Germany. There he was implicated in the resistance movement which led to his imprisonment on 5th April, 1943, and his death by hanging two years later.

Considering his youth and the multifarious activities crowded into the eighteen years which separate his first writings and his last, Bonhoeffer's output is surprisingly large. It is not, however, the extent of his writing which is impressive but the depth and originality of it. His first publication, *Sanctorum Communio*, a Dogmatic Investigation of the Sociology of the Church, was immediately recognised as a work of importance, and nearly thirty years later Karl Barth, in *Kirkliche Dogmatik*, II IV/2, p. 725, could still praise it in almost extravagent terms. Dissatisfied with both liberalism and neo-orthodoxy alike Bonhoeffer sought with great persistence and insight to ask the right questions for this post-Christian age and to suggest the right answers. The continuing interest in Bonhoeffer is due to the fact that he was so disturbingly aware of the need of the Church to re-think its theology and revise its whole attitude both to itself and to the world. As time went on he became more and more engrossed in the problem of following Christ in the modern world. Bonhoeffer may not have all the answers — no-one was more aware of that than he was — but the questions he asks are the right ones. It is a hopeful sign that his influence on the Christian Church is steadily extending around the world. This timely book should do much to further this.

JOHN HENDERSON.

LUTHER'S WORKS

Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Daniel E. Poellet (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis). Vol. 2: *Lectures on Genesis*, Chapters 6-14, 1960, pp. X, 433; $6.00. Vol. 9: *Lectures on Deuteronomy*, 1960, pp. X, 344; $6.00. Companion Volume: *Luther the Expositor*. Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings, by Jaroslav Pelikan, 1959, pp. XII, 286; $4.00.

The new standard edition of Luther's Works is making good progress. More and more of the volumes published by Muehlenberg are appearing on the shelves of the Australian libraries. As they are accessible to the reviewer only there he can only recommend them briefly in our Review on the basis of his own experiences and those of his students. They are indispensable for the study of the Reformation, especially the three volumes on the "Career of the Reformer" with many important documents. Concordia has brought out two more volumes of Old Testament lectures, Deuteronomy and the continuation of Luther's great lectures on Genesis, chapters 6-14. Luther is at his best as exegete in explaining the Old Testament. No-one would expect from him information which could not be given in an age that had not yet learnt to think in terms of historical research. But many years will elapse before a modern exegete arrives at such profound theological insights as Luther shows in interpreting what the Old Testament tells about Noah, Abraham and Moses, or about the Gospel in a book which at first sight seems to be only a book of the Law. Again the editors and the translators (R. Caemmerer and G. V. Schick, St. Louis) have rendered us a great service though some corrections may be needed in future reprints. Space does not allow to quote from texts which may become now classics for English-speaking Christians, e.g., from the great passages on Abraham which begin Gen. 12.

A question of principle is raised by the "companion volume" in

which Professor Pelikan wants "to provide the reader and student of Luther's works with some of the tools he needs for an appreciation of Luther's exegesis. These tools should enable him to identify Luther's procedures in these commentaries on the Scriptures." This is indeed a task, but not a task that can legitimately be performed within the framework of an edition of Luther, even in a "Companion Volume." By being published in a series of Luther's works, in the same wonderful binding as all the other volumes, even with the signature "Martinus Luther," it claims an authority which it never can have. The first principle of editorship, emphasised by Luther himself — he did not like the idea of his works being printed because he regarded only his Catechism and *De servo arbitrio* as deserving survival, but had to give in in order to avoid the dangers of unauthorised spurious editions — is the presentation of the text without comment, excepting illuminations of difficult words and sentences and historical or other factual notes including historical introductions. What would the "Kirchenväterkommission" say if the editor of the new edition of the works of Athanasius would offer them a companion volume discussing the theology of the Father with references to his favourite colleagues? Text and commentary must be distinguished, or a work comprising text and commentary must be written. Professor Pelikan will see that for himself if in a few years' time he notices that this volume has become obsolete in view of the advanced research. The edition itself will remain, with improvements in the case of reprints — as also the Weimar Edition is going through a process of revision — but this volume would at least have to be rewritten. One wonders who actually are the responsible body behind this edition. But perhaps our American friends have still to learn this aspect of an edition which is not only one man's work. Every great edition of this kind needs a patronising and responsible body.

The book has grown out of lectures held on various occasions during five years. Part I deals in six chapters with "The Principles" of Luther's exegesis. Chapter 1 gives come very good observation on the problem "Exegesis and the History of Theology" up to Augustine. None of the great exegetes of the Middle Ages is dealt with, not even in the later parts, as e.g., in the discussion of Luther's exegesis of the eucharistic texts. No-one can understand the exegesis of the Reformers and of the Old Protestant churches without the great exegetical tradition of the Middle Ages. Also the short chapter 4 "Scripture and Tradition" suffers from an insufficient treatment of the problem in the Middle Ages. Pelikan sees the difference between East and West in the emphasis of tradition. But he fails to see why the Latin theology develops a theory on tradition only after the Reformation and under the influence of the first printed editions of the Fathers who up to that time were known mostly in fragments and quotations. A clarification of the various concepts of tradition (N.T. *paradosis, parodosis* in the Ancient Church, in the East since 787, with the Reformers, and the completely different concept of tradition and traditions as a source of doctrine since Trent, the modern attempts on the part of Roman theology to interpret Trent in the direction of the pre-eminent authority of Scorpture, the Anglican views) must precede any fruitful discussion of the burning issue of today. Chapter 3, "The Bible and the Word of God," will be a disappointment for many who seek an answer to that problem. Pelikan tries to find the right balance between the Word of God as deed, as oral word and as written word, but he does not do justice to the written Word. Inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, the unquestioned basis of Luther's view of the Bible which he shares with the Catholic church of all ages are, as far as I can see, not even mentioned. This may partly explain Pelikan's untenable juxtaposition of Scripture and tradition which he wants

to find in Luther. It may also explain his failure to understand why for Luther the authority of the Scriptures is the authority of Christ. One has the impression as if too many subjects have been touched upon in these chapters to allow for a sufficient treatment. — The second Part, "The Practice of Luther's Exegesis: A Case Study," tries to show how Luther applied his principles to one great problem, the exegesis of important passages connected with the Lord's Supper from Matth. 26, John 6, 1 Cor. 10 and 11, Hebr. 9. Here lies the strength of the book, and nobody will read these chapters without getting an impression of Luther's profound searching of the Word of God which perhaps meant more to him than to any of his contemporaries, as even a Roman Catholic scholar like J. Lortz says when he speaks of the unique relationship between Luther and the Bible. This would have come out still more clearly if Pelikan had not read into Luther's words foreign ideas. "Luther's exegesis was based on the presupposition that a human being became an authentic person only when he was brought into participation in the life of God, and that this happened in and by the church" (p. 203). So we read in an explanation of "Participation in the Body of Christ" (1 Cor. 10.16). Luther would never have understood that. Besides it is wrong. Instead of asking what modern existentialist theologians may think of "koinonia tou somatos Christou," one should better consult what Chysostom has to say on his homily on 1 Cor. 10, on "koinonia" and "metalepsis." Another case in point is Pelikan's attempt to read into Luther the idea that the "remembrance of the death of Christ is a pleading with God." Referring to the interpretation of "remembrance" by Gregory Dix, he finds in Luther's exposition of Psalm 111 the idea, "that God remembered the death of Christ and that the church was to remind God of it" (p. 209). Luther says expressly in the passage referred to (WA 31, 1; 417-418; Luther's Works 13,377) of this remembrance: "This takes place through the preaching and the Word of God." It is a public remembrance, a public proclamation that takes place to the end of the world: "And thus in the Sacrament there is not merely food but also the Word of God." The remembrance is preaching. There is not the slightest hint at a pleading with God. The same is true of the passages from the commentary on Isaiah and the lectures on Genesis which Pelikan quotes. It is difficult to understand how a scholar like Professor Pelikan could misunderstand the texts so obviously. We can only hope that this theologian from whom we expect great things will not be absorbed by the requirements of too many duties.

H. SASSE.

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE: NEW TESTAMENT

(Oxford University Press/Cambridge University Press), 1961; Library edition, 34/9 (Aust.), Popular edition, 14/3 (Aust.).

The need for a clear, authoritative, modern translation of the Bible has long been felt, and there are many who believe that the Church's work in approaching the wider public has been hindered by the archaic language of the commonly used Authorised Version. Over sixty years ago, the Oxford "Helps to the Study of the Bible" found it desirable to include explanations of nearly seven hundred obsolete or ambiguous words in that version, and since then the number of such words has certainly not diminished. In this century there has been no dearth of contemporary translations, at least of the New Testament, and these have often been highly meritorious; but they have also been marked, and sometimes marred, by the idiosyncrasies of their individual authors. Something more corporately venturesome and authoritative was required than these lone forays.

Prompted initially by a Presbytery overture in 1946, the Church of Scotland approached other Churches, and as a result a New Translation

is being undertaken by the major Christian Churches and Bible Societies (other than the Roman Catholic) of the British Isles, with the co-operation of the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge. For the task there have been enlisted the most competent scholars available, regardless of denominational considerations. Four panels were appointed to deal respectively with the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the New Testament, and the literary revision of the whole.

Now, after thirteen years' work, the New Testament is available as the first part of the New Translation, whilst work on the other parts continues. It would be too much to expect that the New Translation will receive a unanimously cordial welcome. No man having read the Authorised Version straightway desireth new: for he saith the old is better. This is natural; its own intrinsic merits have made the Authorised Version part of our heritage, from which only the churlish or the grossly irreligious would wish to dislodge it. But the New Translation is not intended to replace the Authorised Version, nor is it to be a mere revision. It aims to encourage the understanding of the Bible by rendering the original Greek into English of the present day, that is, into the natural vocabulary, constructions, and rhythms of contemporary speech, avoiding archaism, jargon, and all that is either stilted or slipshod.

How far that aim has been achieved must be tested in use and will appear only with the passage of time, as the New Version is fairly read and studied. But a first reading, and in many parts a re-reading, calls for ungrudging commendation for a difficult task admirably performed. A fresh clarity pervades the Gospels and the Epistles; the narrative of Acts is excitingly attractive; and the difficult Revelation of John gains in understanding.

Among the more obvious features are the relegation of chapter and verse divisions to the margin, a distinct improvement for the presentation of continuous natural English; the indication of direct speech by inverted commas; and the disappearance of the second person singular pronoun except in reference to God (occasionally this leads to an ambiguity that is not original, as in Luke 22:31-32). Variant readings have been carefully weighed, and important alternatives have been recorded in footnotes, e.g., the various endings of Mark.

Of improvements, there is space for but two or three random examples. The Authorised Version uses "conversation" in Phil. 3:20, Heb. 13:5 and 1 Pet. 1.15 to render three different Greek words which mean respectively "citizenship," "behaviour," and "way of life." Nowadays, when "conversation" stands simply for "talk," the signficance of these passages is lost; but the distinctive meanings are recovered for us in the New Translation. "Ghost," which in current English suggests a spectre, is replaced by "Spirit." In John 2:4, where the Authorised Version gives the appearance of a certain harshness, the words of Jesus are more happily translated: "Your concern, mother, is not mine." The hymn of 1 Cor. 13, often regarded as a test passage for translators, loses none of its force in the New Translation.

It will take time to become accustomed to the new rendering of familiar passages, but there will be gain in the challenge to our minds and hearts in this noteworthy and altogether commendable achievement which aims to present the Scriptures more clearly and more attractively to the people.

At one point we set a real question mark. Probably the English prices of 21/- and 8/6 are reasonable enough. But are the Australian charges of 34/9 and 14/3 a fair translation?

C. S. PETRIE.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching, R. H. Mounce (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, $3.50). After examining first the role of herald in the pre-Christian world and then the work of John the Baptist, Dr. Mounce discusses in turn the preaching of Jesus and the Twelve, preaching in the early Church, and the Apostolic proclamation. He seeks clues to a pre-Pauline *kerugma* and, having determined the origins of the primitive message, reverses direction to follow its subsequent development in the New Testament writings, ending with a summary of the essential nature of preaching. Dr. Mounce acknowledges the importance of C. H. Dodd's *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments,* but shows that Dodd's treatment is too formal and too confined. He holds that the New Testament preaching must be studied as a living thing: the message is such that we must be caught up with it as it is being proclaimed, and we must actually experience its moral implications. Carefully and lucidly this view is developed with the support of New Testament evidence. Preaching is eventually described as "that timeless link between God's great redemptive Act and man's apprehension of it. It is the medium through which God contemporises His historic Self-disclosure and offers man the opportunity to respond in faith." This competent investigation does not gain from its casual references to "the sacramental nature of preaching" (p. 7), such as the brief affirmation that "preaching is sacramental" (p. 154), and a definition of the preacher as "a priest whose message is the sacrament of salvation" (p. 159). There are indexes of authors, subjects and scripture passages. A Hebrew word has been inverted on page 106.

The Gospel According to Saint John, by R. V. G. Tasker, and *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians,* by R. P. Martin (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Tyndale Press, London, 9/6 and 8/6). Dr. Tasker has especially in mind those who find the massive commentaries on the Fourth Gospel more than they can assimilate; and his long teaching experience enables him to deal wisely and faithfully with the Gospel within the imposed limits of the series. The introduction is brief, and is deliberately restricted to the evidence for authorship, date and purpose of the Gospel. For other matters readers are referred to the larger works. In the commentary proper, a verse by verse treatment being obviously impossible, the Gospel has been divided into eight sections, followed by the epilogue and conclusion. There is first a commentary on each section as a whole, and then additional notes on details of special interest and importance. For all its condensation the commentary is remarkably full and valuable. In his introduction, Mr. Martin deals with the Church of Philippi, the epistle's date and place of composition, which are discussed at length and finally left as an open question, its authenticity and unity, its occasion and purpose, and some of its chief features, with special emphasis on fellowship (*koinonia*). The commentary itself is able to cover the epistle in detail and is excellent. The notable passage 2:5-11, which is also the subject of separate discussion (see the next review), appears, whatever its authorship, "distinctive" and "in the form of a quotation which Paul is making to support his appeal to the Philippians." The change of tone in chapter 3 is considered to be not an interpolation but rather an interruption of the intended conclusion in verse 1a, caused by news which calls for a vehement warning and a further charge to steadfastness.

An Early Christian Confession, R. P. Martin (Tyndale Press, 5/-). This is a fuller and more technical discussion of Philippians 2:5-11 in recent interpretation than could be attempted in the abovementioned commentary. The form and authorship of the passage are first

considered, and then there is given a detailed exegetical study of the Greek text. An appendix of notes, with bibliographical references, occupies as much space as the study itself. The study should, in its author's words, "lead naturally, not only to an enhanced appreciation of who He (the Church's Lord) is and what He did, but also to a desire to worship Him."

The Gospel According to Saint Luke, by W. R. F. Browning (Torch Bible Commentaries, S.C.M. Press, 12/6). This volume presents a considerable difference in approach from that of the first in the series, A. M. Hunter's "Mark," published some twelve years earlier. The favouring here of the method of typological exegesis will scarcely command acceptance at all points, but it will certainly lend interest to the book. Those who have no liking for "types" and numerology will nevertheless be compelled to acknowledge even in the short compass of this commentary a freshness of approach, with much forthrightness and common sense. The notes on the Virgin Birth, the wrath of God, Son of Man, Parables, and on various passages throughout the Gospel, are, despite their necessary compression, admirable and right to the point.

C. S. Petrie.

Historical Theology (2 vols.) by William Cunningham, and *The Church of Christ* (2 vols.) by James Bannerman (Banner of Truth Trust, London, 30/- each set). Originally published in 1862 and 1869, these massive works embodying class lectures, by distinguished colleagues of New College, Edinburgh, are each prefaced by a new common biographical introduction by Iain Murray. Like his eminent Princeton contemporary, Charles Hodge, whose *Systematic Theology* has also been reprinted in Great Britain in 1960 (James Clarke, London, 3 vols. at 25/- each) Cunningham's theological position was that of the scholastic Calvinism of Francis Turretine's *Theologia Elenchtica.* In his survey of the building process by which the great land marks of theology became established, the extensive sections, with their thorough treatment and penetrating appraisal, on the Roman, Socinian and Arminian controversies, are of enduring value. Bannerman's work with its analytical method, is probably the most comprehensive treatment of ecclesiology from the Presbyterian viewpoint now in print and its worth is enhanced by its numerous references and appendices. In particular the section setting forth the covenantal conception of baptism reaches a high level. The Disruption Church was powerfully influenced by the democratic movement of the nineteenth century as indicated by the insistence of both writers that the Church as the whole body of believers is the primary subject of Church power, for which position support is wrongly claimed from the Westminster Confession, XXV:3 (*Historical Theology,* I:31, II:536; *The Church of Christ,* I:275, 447) where the Ministry is 'given' to the Church as are the Word and Sacraments which are not subordinate to or the property of the Church. Well produced and moderately priced, the republication of these erudite works of Scottish theology worthily introduce the series of the "Students' Reformed Theological Library."

Men of the Covenant, by Alexander Smellie (Banner of Truth Trust, 15/-). Republished from the seventh edition (1909) this popular classic of biographical sketches well told with true sympathy in clear nervous English, embodies the story of the Church of Scotland through a well-defined period of rigorous persecution matched with steadfast zeal and heroic suffering.

The Lord's Prayer, by Thomas Watson (Banner of Truth Trust, 8/-), hardly constitutes (as stated on the inside of the title page) the

completion of the reprint of a trilogy by the author in exposition of the Westminster Shorter Catechism which is never referred to in the body of the work. However, this direct analysis by the noted Puritan preacher, revealing both wide learning and experience, provides an extensive, lucid and suggestive commentary on the Prayer.

The Waiting Father, by Helmut Thielicke, and *The Apocalypse Today,* by Thomas F. Torrance (James Clarke, London, 12/6 and 13/6). These sermon volumes on widely diverse themes are both from distinguished theologians. The German in his interpretation of the Parables seeks the "only *one* point from which they can be unlocked." Thus in the "coded telegram" of the Labourers in the Vineyard the salient point is "that this is work which takes place in the *vineyard,* and that therefore it should be service for the Lord, and for this very reason cannot be viewed as something earned or merited" (p. 117). Biblical and relevant, vivid and direct, here is powerful preaching by a Hamburg professor who thrice weekly holds a congregation of 4,000. The Scot in his more difficult task presents a systematic exposition of Revelation with its dominant theme — "this is the strange mystery of iniquity that evil was and is not and yet is, but it *shall not be* . . . it shall go to perdition engulfed at last in a terrible Niagara of power and shattering destruction" (pp. 107-8). Delivered during and after the last War these discourses will enlighten the ordinary Christian as to the contemporary significance of this mysterious book.

Divine Election, by G. C. Berkouwer (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, $4.50), discussess in a wide diversity of aspects the Reformed Confessional doctrine especially as formulated in the Canons of Dordt. The modern criticism of Barth and others that election has been conceived as an abstract decree of which Christ is nothing but the executor is partly rebutted by the place given to the *pactum Salutis.* The volume lacks a detailed examination and assessment of Barth's novel position as given in the author's *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth.* Rejecting the arbitrary *potentia absoluta* of scholastic nominalism and any simplistic parallelism (*eodem modus*) between election and reprobation, the motif of infralapsarianism, the orientation of predestination to the fallen human race, is emphasised as the way both of preaching and theological reflection; but, if supralapsarianism is endangered by monism, infralapsarianism has the attendant danger of dualism, in that the temporal concept of succession by obscuring the unity and historicising the acts of God presents "a clear form of humanisation of God" (p. 267). In his discussion of the *syllogismus practicus* (the assurance of salvation from good works), Berkouwer agrees with Barth against Niesel that it does not constitute a threat against the *sola fide* in that, reflecting the necessary Biblical connection between the christological and pneumatological (justification and sanctification) any dilemma between election to serve and election to salvation is unacceptable. The seventh to be translated into English in the author's "Studies in Dogmatics" series, this volume presents the most complete and balanced modern exposition from Calvinist orthodoxy of that doctrine which Abraham Kuyper has termed "the heart of the Church."

Archaeology and the New Testament, by J. A. Thompson, and *Christian Ministry,* by G. W. Bromiley (Eerdmans, $1.50 each). In the first of these small "Pathway Books," the Australian author, completing his trilogy on the Biblical period, presents a useful summary on the subject in which the really significant discoveries are not nearly so striking as those that refer to the Old Testament. Special interest attaches to the recent discovery of the documents at Chenoboskion and the scrolls at Qumran in their bearing on the Fourth Gospel, in that,

showing that the New Testament writing is closer to the ethical dualism of the Qumran sect than the material dualism of the Gnostics, "it would seem, therefore, that we have reached a position in the study of John's Gospel where archaeological evidence practically compels us to agree to a first-century date for its original composition" (p. 119). The most distinctive aspect of Bromiley's thesis is that, arising from the conception of the offices of Christ as Prophet. Priest and King," the ministry of the Church naturally and necessarily takes the form of presbyterate, diaconate and episcopate in fulfilment of the threefold service of word and action and rule" (pp. 79-80). The viewpoint is moderate Anglican with a strong emphasis on the ministry of the laity.

The Memoirs Called Gospels, by G. P. Gilmour (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 31/9 Aust.). A general introduction to the Bible, especially the Gospels, is followed by a survey of the latter as the witness to Him in Whom "there was an inexplicable combining of human obedience and Divine authority" (p. 85). The treatment is fresh, if not original, and the balanced presentation is given lucid, sometimes striking, expression. Thus: "whereas the synoptic evangelists approach the life of Jesus as a first-century historical incident illuminated by glimpses of eternal light, the Fourth Evangelist approaches it as a revelation of eternal light and truth caught in the momentary circumstances of a first-century incident" (p. 221). Based originally on a course of lectures to undergraduates at a Canadian university, this volume, which includes an extensive bibliography for further study, will provide useful guidance for the inquiring general reader.

The Dead Sea Scrolls, by R. K. Harrison (English Universities Press, London, 11/3 Aust.), is an up-to-date interim report covering the discovery, contents and date of the manuscripts, with a reasoned assessment of their relationship to the Old Testament, the Essenes and Christianity. With respect to the superficial correspondences between Christianity and the Qumran fellowship it is discretely observed that "since Christianity has always made clear the wealth of its Jewish heritage it follows that not all things regarded as distinctively Christian are necessarily newcomers to the historical scene" (pp. 104-5). This well-informed survey concludes with a Short Bibliography for further reading.

Studies in the Sermon on the Mount, Vol. 2, by D. Martyn Lloyd Jones (I.V.F., London, 15/-) completes, with a further 30 discourses on Matthew 6 and 7, the London preacher's exposition of this portion of Scripture (see Vol. XIX, pp. 61-2). The moral principles so clearly and cogently presented in these sermons are based on "the whole doctrine of the incarnation of Christ" (p. 334). In refuting dispensationalist views concerning the Lord's Prayer it is unguardedly asserted "that our Lord here was telling these people how He Himself prayed" (p. 51) — a statement that could hardly apply to the fifth petition. Instructive and challenging, this is expositionary preaching of a high order.

Makers of Religious Freedom, by Marcus Loane (I.V.F., 4/6), consists of short perceptive studies of the life and work of Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, John Bunyan and Richard Baxter. Here the Anglican bishop writes with a remarkable sympathy for Scottish Covenanter and English Puritan who alike were "fired by an inner nobility of motive and ideal" (p. 8).

The Bible in the Age of Science, by Alan Richardson (S.C.M. Press, 5/-), embodying a series of lectures delivered successively at

Birmingham, Dunedin and Melbourne (rather misnamed as to title) discusses in a stimulating and lucid way modern movements in Biblical theology. Professor Richardson rejects the existentialist viewpoint as confusing mythology with Biblical symbolism and in particular characterises the teaching of Bultmann as "a kind of latter-day Ritschlianism" (p. 112) functioning within the old Liberal Protestant framework. Provokingly he asserts: "The Hebrew tongue is the basis of the scriptural symbol-language, and a theological blunder was committed when it was decided that, if theological students were too hard pressed to learn more than one ancient language, then that language should be Greek" (p. 152).

Deliverance to the Captives, by Karl Barth (S.C.M. Press, 12/6) contains 18 sermons delivered in 1954-9 mainly to inmates of the Basel prison. Marked by true understanding and sympathy, the simple exposition is centred in the Gospel in which *"His* story now becomes *ours,* just as before *ours* became *His"* (p. 149). Unscriptural universalism is expressed particularly in the assertion concerning the two thieves who died with Christ that "theirs was the assurance that they were also literally to live with Him" (p. 82). The Prison Chaplain remarks that when the theologian turned preacher "the thought was even ventured that in order to hear Karl Barth preach, one had to break the law and be put in jail" (p. 11). If only in print, these discourses will be widely welcomed in a state of law-abidingness and freedom.

R. Swanton.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither precludes nor implies subsequent comment.)

Banner of Truth Trust, London: Reprints — *Andrew Bonar: Diary and Life,* ed. Marjory Bonar, 12/6; *A Summary of Christian Doctrine,* Louis Berkhof, 3/-; *Robert Bruce, Minister in the Kirk of Edinburgh,* D. C. Macnicol; *Robert Murray M'Cheyne,* Andrew Bonar; *Christ is All: The Gospel in Genesis,* Henry Law; *Letters of John Newton; The Rich Man and Lazarus,* Brownlow North, 2/6 each.

James Clarke & Co., London: *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology,* E. A. Litton, 27/6; *The Christian's Knowledge of God* (1st Brit. Ed.), W. W. Bryden, 15/-; *Interpreted by Love,* James Ferguson, 12/6; *Thanks be to God,* R. H. Rodenmayer, 9/6.

Eerdmans, Grand Rapids: *A Guide to the Teachings of the Early Church Fathers,* R. R. Williams, $4.00; *The Old Testament View of Revelation,* J. G. S. S. Thomson, $2.50; *The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life,* E. J. Carnell, $3.50; *The Cross Through the Open Tomb,* D. G. Barnhouse, $3.00; *Eutychus (and his pin),* E. P. Clowney, $2.50; *King of the West Side,* W. Heuman, $2.50.

Hodder & Stoughton, London: *I am Lucifer: Confessions of the Devil,* C. B. Glason, 24/- (Aust.); *God so Loved the World: A Life of Christ,* Elizabeth Goudge, 5/3 (Aust.); *Thinking Through the Creed,* Hugh Burnaby, 6/9 (Aust.); *Calm Delight,* Elsie Chamberlain, 3/9 (Aust.).

Inter-Varsity Fellowship, London: *The Man God Mastered* (A Brief Biography of John Calvin), Jean Cadier, 8/6; *Expounding God's Word* and *God's Church,* Alan Stibbs, 4/6 each; *The Spirit of the Living God,* Leon Morris, 4/-; *The Christian and His Bible,* Douglas Johnson, 4/-; *A Guide to Christian Reading,* revised and edited by A. F. Walls, 6/6; *Sacrifice* (5th ed.), Howard Guinness, 2/-; *Christian Witness in the World,* B. F. Batt, 9d.

John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia. *A Theology of Proclamation,* Dietrich Ritschl, $3.50.

J. H. Kok, Kampen, Holland: *Die Gees van God en die Gees van die Mens in die Ou Testament,* J. H. Scheepers, F.9.50.

S.C.M. Press, London: *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* John Calvin (Ed. J. T. McNeill), £6/6/- for 2 vols.; *The Living Word,* Gustaf Wingren, 25/-; *A Gospel Without Myth,* David Cairns, 25/-; *The Confession Westminster for Today,* George S. Hendry, 21/- (American edition briefly reviewed Vol. XIX, p. 91); *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries,* Joachim Jeremias, 12/6; *The Pioneer Ministry,* Anthony T. Hanson, 21/-; *A Dialogue of Religions,* Ninian Smart, 18/-; *Ethics and the Gospel,* T. W. Manson, 12/6; *The Theological Foundation of Law,* Jacques Ellul, 18/-; *On the Eightfold Path* (Christian Presence amid Buddhism), George Appleton, 12/6; *Jeremiah,* H. Cuncliffe-Jones, 15/-; *I and II Peter and Jude,* C. E. B. Cranfield, 12/6; *One Lord One Baptism,* World Council of Churches' Theological Commission on Christ and the Church, 6/-; *The Church and the Arts,* ed. Frank Glendenning, 6/-; *Christianity and Communism Today* (1st Brit. Ed.), J. C. Bennett, 6/-; *A Christian in East Germany,* Johannes Hamel, 8/6; *The Recovery of Confidence* (The Bible in our Time), E. H. Robertson, 4/-.

S.P.C.K., London: *William Temple's Philosophy of Religion,* Owen C. Thomas, 22/6; *The Communication of the Gospels in New Testament Times,* Theological Collections by various writers, 8/6; *The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles,* James Kallas, 12/6; *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology,* T. Francis Glasson, 9/6; *The Significance of Satan,* Trevor Ling, 12/6.

Tyndale Press, London: *New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles,* 18/6; *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* Thomas Hewitt, 9/6; *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment,* Leon Morris, 5/-; *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John,* J. N. Birdsall, 1/6.

Westminster Fellowship, Dunedin: *A Great Scottish Churchman: Dr. Andrew Thomson,* R. Strang Miller, 3/6.

Zwingli Verlag: Zürich: *Petrus* (2nd ed.), Oscar Cullmann (English translation of 1st ed. reviewed, Vol. XIII, pp. 21, 2).

Book Reviews

Page

BARTH, KARL. *Fides Quaerens Intellectum* 50
By the Rev. E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., Emmanuel College, University of Queensland.

BRIGHT, JOHN: *A History of Israel* 51
By the Rev. F. I. Andersen, M.A., M.Sc., B.D., Ph.D., Vice-Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne.

BURLEIGH, J. H. S.: *A Church History of Scotland* 53
By the Rev. Robert Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

GODSEY, JOHN D.: *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer* .. 54
By the Rev. Professor John Henderson, M.A., Ph.D., Knox College, Dunedin.

PELIKAN, JAROSLAV (Ed.): *Luther's Works,* Vols. 2, 9 and Companion 55
By the Rev. Professor H. Sasse, D.Theol., of Immanuel Seminary, Adelaide.

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE: *New Testament* 57
By the Rev. C. S. Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Vic.

SHORTER NOTICES 59

BOOKS RECEIVED 63

W. D. Vaughan Pty. Ltd. Print, 126-128 Denmark St., Kew, Victoria.

JUL 24 1961